DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 152 SP 039 881

AUTHOR Beckmann, Sybilla; Davion, Victoria; Desmet, Christy; Harrison, Stephanie; Hudson-Ross, Sally; Mewborn, Denise S.; Oliver, Jenny Penney; Preissle, Judith; Ruppersburg, Hugh

TITLE Expanding the "Great Conversation" To Include Arts and Sciences Faculty.

PUB DATE 2001-03-02

NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (53rd, Dallas, TX, March 1-4, 2001).

PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; English; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Language Arts; *Mathematics Education; Mathematics Teachers; Preservice Teacher Education; *Science Education; Science Teachers; *Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Role

IDENTIFIERS *Collaborative Inquiry; University of Georgia

ABSTRACT

This paper contains five essays that describe various aspects of a collaboration called the Deans' Forum at the University of Georgia. A group of 30 faculty committed to exploring issues such as the nature and quality of instruction in university courses, course and curriculum design, learning theories relevant to college age learners, the role of the university in teacher preparation and enhancement, and the role of the university in the P-16 agenda. The five essays are: "How We Got To Expanding the 'Great Conversation' to Include A&S Faculty" (Jenny Penney Oliver); "Reflections on Our Role in Teacher Education by Two Faculty in the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Georgia" (Victoria Davion and Hugh Ruppersburg); "The Deans' Forum: Cross-Career Dialogue in English and English Education" (Sally Hudson-Ross, Christy Desmet, and Stephanie Harrison). "The Collaborative Design of Mathematics Courses for Elementary Education Majors" (Sybilla Beckmann and Denise S. Mewborn); and "Outcomes of the Dean's Forum" (Judith Preissle). (Contains 35 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 152

Expanding the "Great Conversation" to Include Arts and Sciences Faculty

Sybilla Beckmann
Victoria Davion
Christy Desmet
Stephanie Harrison
Sally Hudson-Ross
Denise S. Mewborn
Jenny Penney Oliver
Judith Preissle
Hugh Ruppersburg

University of Georgia
Athens, GA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

D.S. Mewborn

Paper presented at the 53rd annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, March 2, 2001, Dallas, TX.

SP039881

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Expanding the "Great Conversation" to Include Arts and Sciences Faculty

Shulman (1986) characterized the ongoing dialogue about understanding and improving teaching as a "Great Conversation" (p. 9) that is substantially influenced by the disciplinary roots, commitments, and ideologies of those involved. Although Shulman intended this characterization to describe the conversations among educators about research on teaching, it applies equally well to the contemporary discussions surrounding teacher preparation. The direction of the Great Conversation about teacher preparation is being influenced by those who are participating. Typically, the participants in this conversation have been faculty from colleges of education, policymakers, and professional organizations. However, it is becoming increasingly important to include faculty from colleges of arts and sciences in the Great Conversation.

Numerous contemporary policy documents recommend that faculty from Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Colleges of Education work together to create a more seamless teacher preparation curriculum (e.g., National Commission on Teaching and American's Future 1996). These documents point out that current teacher education programs are fragmented–chronologically and philosophically. Students typically take content courses in their first two years and methods courses in their last two years and culminate with student teaching. The content courses and methods courses are often not connected; the instructors do no communicate with one another, and the content does not truly serve as a prerequisite for the methods courses. Further, many current policy documents are urging that education majors take more coursework in content areas housed in the college of arts and sciences. Thus, it is imperative that faculty form both colleges engage in meaningful dialogue about the goals of teacher preparation and the role of content courses in teacher preparation.

Toward this end, in 1996 the deans of the colleges of education and arts and sciences at the University of Georgia created the Deans' Forum, a group of approximately 30 faculty committed to exploring issues such as the nature and quality of instruction in university courses, course and curriculum design, learning theories relevant to college age learners, the role of the university in teacher preparation and enhancement, and the role of the university in the P-16 agenda. Over the course of the last four years, members of the group have navigated this uncharted territory in various ways. While there are numerous accounts in the literature of colleges of education working with public schools in the area of teacher preparation, there are few examples of what collaboration across colleges within the university might look like. The benefits and struggles of such collaborations are relatively uncharted. In this paper we present a collection of five essays that describe various aspects of our collaboration.

How We Got To Expanding the "Great Conversation" to Include A & S Faculty

Jenny Penney Oliver
Director of Academic Initiatives for the College of Education

For some time at the University of Georgia there has been an atmosphere conducive to enhanced relationships between faculty in education and arts and sciences. Over a number of years and a number of deanships the college of education has been interested in and proactive about increased interaction across the two colleges. While there was some dialogue across the colleges, and examples of individual faculty in education and arts and sciences collaborating on grants and other initiatives, these efforts were, at best, ad hoc. There was nothing formally in place that would inform programmatic decisions in relation to the preparation of various educators. This fact was of concern as well as potentially problematic considering that college of education students take over half of their coursework in the college of arts and sciences. Therefore, the need seemed obvious -- the Great Conversation must be expanded -- but how?

As if on cue, during fall, 1996, the National Science Foundation sponsored a meeting of arts and sciences and education deans from around the country to participate together in a weekend meeting designed to facilitate dialogue between the two colleges. Presentations by various speakers, including arts and sciences and education deans, and other administrators, prompted participants, which included UGA's deans of education and arts and sciences, to consider how broader, more cooperative arrangements may be reached on their campuses for dealing with issues related to teaching and learning. While there was no particular criteria set forth for, nor any expectations of developing a plan, at some point during this meeting the participants were asked what they would do with this information once they were back on their campuses. It was this question that ultimately found its answer in the establishment of the University of Georgia Deans' Forum.

Energized by the weekend conversations, the UGA deans drafted the initial planning document that outlined the nature, the mission and the overall structure of the Deans' Forum on the return flight from the NSF meeting. Once back on campus they met several times and found they continued to resonate with the idea of creating some type of formal structure to capture the cross college interactions they both valued and knew needed to become more formalized and sanctioned. For several weeks the two deans went back and forth on refining their thinking about the structure, purpose and direction of the Deans' Forum. They sought the reaction and endorsement of the Vice President for Academic Affairs who embraced the idea conceptually and financially.

Beyond having a workable concept in place to guide the Forum, which the deans saw as the first most crucial decision to reach, they recognized the importance of identifying the "right kinds of people" as participants. Because they believed interaction through the Forum would help participants develop a broader and enhanced perspective about various issues surrounding teaching and learning, they sought individuals with diverse perspectives and areas of expertise

across the two colleges They targeted individuals who had high respect in their own units, would carry the discussions from the Deans' Forum back to their units and help weave it into the dialogue there, and that wanted to make an impact on programs -- in other words, "opinion leaders" from the two colleges Ultimately it was decided that 15 faculty from each college would be selected and that the deans would function as peer faculty themselves in the Forum A final issue to resolve was how to actually operationalize the vision of the Forum The deans wanted to be persuasive about the value they placed on this initiative but did not want the Forum to be a top-down driven activity. They hoped that once they "got themselves to the right place and engaged in the topics" the mechanism would be established Therefore the initial meeting of the Deans' Forum was planned with 50% structured and 50% unstructured time, believing in the wisdom of these "opinion leaders" to help set the course of the Forum once hearing the overall purpose and vision.

Therefore, in March, 1997, at the initial dinner meeting of the UGA Deans' Forum, 30 faculty from the two colleges were invited to come together to hear and discuss the vision of the deans regarding this initiative. Working in groups around the themes of "mission", "topics" and "mechanics" the participants massaged the original planning document to propose a scheme for proceeding.

The mission working group embraced the importance of facilitating the interaction between faculty in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Education through the establishment of a Deans' Forum. Further, they identified the Forum as "providing a mechanism for the exploration of such issues as: (1) the nature and quality of instruction in university courses; (2) course and curriculum design; (3) learning theories relevant to college age learners; (4) the role of the university in teacher preparation and enhancement; and, (5) the role of the university in the P-16 agenda." The working group also thought the Forum should "support dialog and inquiry into: (1) the effectiveness of various instructional approaches; (2) the appropriateness of the curriculum to support programs, goals, and missions; (3) the needs and problems of P-16 education; and, (4) the role of the university in addressing these needs."

The working group assigned to "topics" suggested a variety of activities that could be coordinated and supported by the Forum. Among the activities suggested were seminars, workshops, and minicourses. The group believed that visiting scholars with areas of scholarship that address the interests of the Forum should also be identified. In addition, the group thought that faculty in the Forum should develop position papers, grant proposals, and research projects. Finally, they suggested that Forum participants might also receive special recognition for their contributions to the study of issues related to teaching and learning and be given the opportunity for study leaves to address relevant problems.

The "mechanics" working group supported the idea that membership in the Forum should include those faculty who are able to influence the direction of instructional programs. Additionally they proposed that participants might join the Forum through appointment by the deans as was the case currently, or by the invitation of existing members, or through an

application process. There was also a recommendation that membership on and off the Forum rotate in order to create the "broadest wake" possible. The final input from the mechanics group were plans for the first, of many, two day retreats for the Forum, this one to focus on the "Scholarship of Teaching".

And finally, the participants embraced the overall goals for the Forum proposed by the Deans. These goals state that "the existence and function of Deans' Forum studies at the University of Georgia should lead to: (1) an elevated status and scholarly level of education related activities; (2) improved quality of the curriculum and instruction; (3) increased involvement in P-16 issues; and, (4) improved experience for and quality of teacher education to meet P-12 need".

The Forum was launched.

Reflections on Our Role in Teacher Education by Two Faculty in the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Georgia

Victoria Davion
Associate Professor of Philosophy

Hugh Ruppersburg
Professor of English
Associate Dean of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences

In theory, institutions of higher education value interdisciplinary collaboration. Yet there is no working model from a large land-grant research institution that exemplifies an institutionalized strategy for true interdisciplinary collaboration between Arts and Science and P-12 teacher preparation faculty, focused on jointly developed goals. The recent national attention given to the quality of P-12 education has compelled those teaching in Arts and Sciences to consider the effect of their teaching on those students in their classrooms who may go on to teach in P-12. Because a substantial number of courses required for a degree from the College of Education are Arts and Sciences courses, the question of teacher preparation must be addressed as an organic whole. Faculty in Arts and Sciences play a major role in teaching future P-12 instructors, who then teach students who eventually end up in Arts and Sciences classes themselves. Hence, it is crucial that Arts and Sciences faculty see ourselves as part of the teacher education process. Along with a number of other activities, the Dean's Forum has provided vital opportunities for collaboration between faculty in the College of Education and in Arts and Sciences, and has helped to make clear both the holistic nature of teacher preparation, and the joint responsibility between the two colleges.

Reflections of a Philosopher

I never gave the idea that I was responsible for P-12 teacher preparation a single thought until I began attending the Dean's Forum. Although I had been known (on occasion) to complain that some of my students did not seem prepared for a collegiate level class, it never occurred to me that this had anything at all to do with me. This was the responsibility of classroom teachers and those who prepared them, not me! A crucial reason why I failed to see myself as part of the what I now call the teacher preparation loop is that my subject, philosophy, is not normally taught as a separate subject in P-12. So, I did not see myself as connected to experiences students might have had being taught philosophy prior to entering my classroom.

Attending the Forum opened my eyes to the fact that I am part of the teacher preparation process, as many future teachers take my courses. One result of this was my becoming more curious about the P-12 curriculum, another was that I began to see myself as at least somewhat responsible for teacher preparation. The Forum not only helped make may connection to teacher preparation visible to me, it sponsored "cross pair" collaborations, including at least one faculty member from each college. I began an ongoing collaboration with Professor Judith Preissle, Head of the Foundations of Education Program in the College of Education. Our project is to

interview students in introductory ethics classes in order to see where and how they learned to reason through ethical dilemmas prior to taking the class.

Professor Preissle sat in on most of the classes one semester, and has been interviewing students from ethics classes asking them questions about what they had learned and where they learned it prior to the class. I am learning a great deal from this project already. For example, I now know that some of this material is taught in social studies classes, and many students learn critical reasoning skills by participating in debate clubs. Of course, this information was always available to me, but I was never particularly interested in it. In addition, I am learning that many students wish they had had courses on reasoning through ethical dilemmas in P-12, and I have become interested in how such material might be made available more explicitly in the P-12 curriculum. Hence, participating in the Dean's Forum has made my part in teacher preparation visible to me, and has sparked my interest in it on a variety of levels. I am currently involved in another project which I expect will take me into some P-12 classrooms, something I would never have considered interesting before attending the Forum.

Reflections of a Teacher of American Literature

For much of my career as a teacher of courses devoted to the understanding and appreciation of literature, I had little concern about practical outcomes. That is, enhanced appreciation in my students in and of itself seemed sufficient. Perhaps I gave some thought to the possibility that some of my students might go on to graduate school, where they would become teachers like me. And I knew that in my class there were future lawyers and journalists and civic leaders for whom the appreciation of literature could not help but serve as an ennobling force. And I further knew that in my classes there were many others, future parents, soldiers, real estate agents, salespeople, ministers, who would benefit all their lives from the appreciation I sought to foster.

All the while I taught these classes there sat in my classrooms invisible students. They were invisible because they had career goals different from those of the people I just described. Although they too would benefit from enhanced appreciati .a of great writers and literature, they had a more practical reason for studying English and literature. They were teachers in preparation, not Arts and Sciences majors like most of my students, but Education majors. They were preparing to enter the classrooms of our public (and private) schools, to contribute to the education of our nation's people, to help students meet one of the essential requirements for citizens in American democracy–literacy and education, awareness and understanding of the outer world, of history, science, language, and culture. They were, in many ways, the most serious students sitting in my classes, the students who would have the greatest influence on the future through the students they themselves would teach. And they were invisible to me.

Being able to see these students became the first step to being able to serve them. As with my colleague in Philosophy, my participation in a number of activities built on a

developing partnership between Arts and Sciences and Education helped me to develop an understanding of and concern for the needs of my teacher education students. There was first of all the announcement from our State Board of Regents, that oversees the University System in the State of Georgia, that teacher preparation is the shared responsibility of teachers in arts and sciences as well as in education, and the promise that we will be evaluated, at some point, on the success of our teacher preparation efforts. There was next the Dean's Forum, the Standards-Based Teacher Education Project (STEP) that brought Arts and Sciences and Education faculty together to evaluate the courses teachers in training take in both colleges, the P-16 Initiative, designed to enhance education at all levels in the state of Georgia, and finally there was the Georgia Systemic Teacher Education Project. Faculty from three University system schools, in both Education and Arts and Sciences, worked on this proposal for nearly two years. Designed to improve the final two years of teacher training and the first two years that teachers spend in the classroom, the GSTEP project was funded on a five-year basis for 6.49 million dollars by the Department of Education and is now underway, with Arts and Sciences faculty playing a significant role.

There are many practical considerations that I am now mindful of as one of many Arts and Sciences faculty engaged in the training of new teachers. I would list among these the issues of the books that I choose to teach (will they be useful to teachers in the classroom), the kinds of theoretical methods that I use in treating these works, the teaching styles I employ (my own teaching style serves as a teaching model, whether good or bad), the assignments I give. It is not that I have wholly redesigned my classes and the ways I teach. It is instead that I have incorporated into my thinking an additional set of needs and standards. I am teaching not only to Arts and Sciences students, not merely to the students for whom a higher appreciation of the arts is a sufficient end. I am plugged into a large network–also formerly invisible–of teachers, administrators, and others engaged in the education of teachers. Although I continue to believe in the importance of fostering literary appreciation, I fully recognize now that it is not and can ever be allowed to stand as the only basic goal I serve.

Brief Reflections of an Arts and Sciences Administrator

Shared responsibility for the training of teachers means, for an Arts and Sciences dean, the necessity of thinking outside the traditional disciplinary boundaries of departments and colleges. In specific, three related areas of responsibility that require a dean's creative ingenuity deserve comment: (1) enhanced leadership–Arts and sciences deans, while respecting the importance of faculty governance and academic freedom, must persuade their faculties of the importance of their role in teacher education. This may mean convincing faculty to discard long-held conceptions about the importance of their own mission and about the goals of colleges of education; (2) enhanced resources–When necessary, either through providing new funds or (more likely in this age of limited resources) redirection of existing funds, deans must insure that arts and sciences departments have the teaching resources needed to accommodate teachers

in training; and (3) deans must work to persuade faculty and other administrators of the importance of recognizing the work of arts and sciences faculty in teacher education through the establishment of criteria that provide adequate recognition when salary increases are assigned and when promotion-tenure decisions are made.

The Deans' Forum: Cross-Career Dialogue in English and English Education

Sally Hudson-Ross
Associate Professor of Language Education

Christy Desmet
Associate Professor of English

Stephanie Harrison
English Teacher and Department Chair
Madison County High School

> "My goal as a teacher of literature is to introduce them to the moveable feast of words, tuck their napkins under their chins, and hand them a fork (while standing nearby to point out the tastiest morsels). Ultimately I would like them to make reading part of their regular diets, even if they eat the equivalent of cheeseburgers and fries" (Scott, p. 32).

The Deans' Forum is a group of faculty at The University of Georgia that was brought together by Dean Russ Yeany (College of Education) and Dean Wyatt Anderson (College of Arts and Sciences) to make stronger connections between the Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences at our institution. Sally Hudson-Ross, from the Department of Language Education, and Christy Desmet, in the English Department, had known each other informally across the physical distance and size of our large, 30,000-student campus for 10 years, but the Deans' Forum dinners, retreats, and support for collaborative research brought us together for the first time to explore issues of common interest.

At an early Deans' Forum retreat, the responsibility of both colleges for preparing teachers emerged as an important topic. Some of Christy's students in Arts and Sciences English courses--from freshman composition through junior courses for majors--become Sally's students in their senior year when they choose careers as English teachers in public secondary schools. During our preliminary talks, we wondered, "Which is more important for teachers of English: knowledge of teaching as a pedagogical process or knowledge of the subject matter?" When the same question came up again on a Georgia Council of Teachers of English (GCTE) panel that summer, we decided to find out just what teachers at different stages of their careers thought about the relationship between pedagogy and subject matter in their teaching lives. And so this project was born.

A listserv among 14 students and teachers from various geographic locations and stages in their careers provided an in-depth, two-month conversation. In this paper, we examine those discussions from the diverse perspectives of three participants: Christy as an English professor and rhetoric/literary scholar, Sally as an English educator and researcher in school/university collaborations, and Stephanie as a public school teacher and teacher researcher. If readers would like to experience the conversations directly, the raw data are available on our web site at:

http://virtual.park.uga.edu/cdesmet/forum/

Theoretical Framework

Many calls for school reform in the U.S. demand the enhancement of teachers' knowledge of disciplinary content in order to improve student achievement (e.g., National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, 1996). American secondary or high schools are constructed around disciplinary departments which provide social and professional hubs for teachers (Clark and LaLonde, 1992; Grossman & Stodolsky, 1995). Most high school teachers define themselves by their field, and some feel more affinity to same-discipline teachers across schools than to teachers within other departments in their own schools (Siskin, 1991).

Disciplinary departments create unique, often rival subcultures which can be problematic (Siskin, 1991). Differences may range from the mundane but very real competition for resources to epistemological divisions (Grossman & Stodolsky, 1995). Richardson (1997) acknowledges that teachers are conscious of the boundedness of their fields (e.g., mathematics as more bounded or English as less bounded). In studies of teaching for disciplinary understanding, Gardner and Boix-Mansilla (1994) found that English teachers "find it easier to allow the time and exploration needed for understanding" (p. 216) because their field is more open to inquiry and has a less delineated knowledge based than math or science.

There are both pros and cons of discrete disciplines as the focus of teaching and learning at the secondary level, as calls for interdisciplinary reform and concerns about reversion to subject matter coverage, rather than understanding in a field, make clear (Gardner & Boix-Mansilla, 1994; Miller & Silvernail, 1994; Whitford, 1994). The latter may result from undergraduates developing ideas not in accord with scholars in a field or being able to do satisfactory college work while not fully developing a "conceptual understanding of subject matter" (Ball & McDiarmid, 1990, p. 444).

At the same time, concentration on disciplinary knowledge alone often does not serve beginning teachers fully (Grossman, 1990). Shulman (1986; Shulman & Sparks, 1992) and others (see Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999) argue that knowledge of a discipline is not enough for productive teaching and learning. Teachers must also have expertise in "pedagogical content knowledge" or knowledge of how to teach in particular disciplines. According to Bransford et. al. in their extensive review of research on teaching and learning, "teachers' knowledge of the discipline and their knowledge of pedagogy interact. But knowledge of the discipline structure does not in itself guide a teacher. Expert teachers are sensitive to those aspects of the discipline that are especially hard and easy for new students to master" (p. xviii). Yet inservice workshops for teachers and many preservice programs focus on generic pedagogical concepts, and the public and media continue to believe that education courses are unworthy of time or attention (e.g., Anderson & Stepp, 1999).

What it means to be an English teacher or scholar-what one's goals, expectations, and theories might be--remains contested territory in the literature (Graff, 1992; Morgan, 1995) and often in a local school community. We all know of teachers "down the hall" who barely speak

because of their differences in philosophies about teaching and learning. Colleges and universities are no less diverse in their interpretations of the field than are schools. In a wide-ranging U.S. survey of education and English professors, Dilworth and McCracken (1997) found that English and English education professors differ widely in theoretical stances and that all too often beginning teachers must construct their own coherent philosophy and pedagogy of English from the cacophony of separate voices.

Even within English Education programs, Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) learned from reviews of syllabi that professors teaching methods courses for teachers come from a variety of theoretical positions including (a) a Piagetian stance based on an assumption of natural development, (b) transactional theories of literary response, (c) approaches involving instructional scaffolding, (d) sociocultural perspectives on learning, and (e) a focus on language as process. Most interesting for any individual preservice teacher, Smagorinsky and Whiting also found that professors often "freely adopt strategies from a variety of texts, whether or not the motivating theories are consistent with one another" (p. 52).

When prospective teachers must find their own way through the often conflicting theories of English provided by an array of teachers in high schools, English studies, and English education, it is not surprising that they are sometimes angry, frustrated, confused, exhausted, and seemingly ungrounded as they begin teaching. Add to this mix the pervasive public and academic perception that teachers should "know the right answers" (Christenbury, 1994) juxtaposed with the educational research bent toward a more "constructivist" theory of teaching and learning that encourages teachers to "facilitate an environment in which students undergo a certain amount of cognitive dissonance" (Richardson, 1997, p. 5), and we begin to encounter the complexities of learning to teach.

Many educators argue the need to give beginners access to these disciplinary understandings and discussions and to make our debates explicit (Dilworth & McCracken, 1997; Graff, 1992). Others argue that we simply need to think more deeply about the assumptions we make and do not explore across settings of English studies, English education, and schools (Marshall, 1994). Some suggest that introducing new voices to discussions in the disciplines inevitably strengthens and pushes "experts" in the field in new directions (Kuhn, 1962; Rorty, 1979), and that undergraduate and even secondary school students should be engaged in real research in more equal ways (Boyer Commission, 1998). All of these calls argue for new roles and relationships among the players.

Technology provides new ways to break down physical and intellectual boundaries that have been established for centuries. Anyone can now send off an email to an author or university professor and hope for a quick response. Professors and their undergraduates routinely engage in on-line discussions that extend course content (Thomas, Clift, & Sugimoto, 1996). More traditionally, however, we discuss our fields within closed boundaries of rank and expertise as well as subject matter. Professional and intellectual journals are written and read among colleagues, limiting readership by membership or expense and by insider language styles. Even

as new technologies open up dialogue--say among professors and their students--research shows that beginning teachers or other undergraduate students tend to use listservs more for moral, social and emotional support rather than "professional information exchanges" (Thomas, et. al., 1996) especially when the structure is too free and open (Merseth, 1991). Very commonly students participating in class email discussions interact primarily with professors and accept their role as questioners receiving information (Schlagal, Trathen, & Blanton, 1996; Thomas et. al., 1996). However, any change in who speaks to whom about what has the potential to raise issues of power, status, authority, and the nature of expertise.

Our listserv was different from many in the research literature in four ways: (1) participants were not in a class and participation was not required or assigned, (2) participants ranged across settings and career stages, (3) our goals were not to improve anyone's work, and instead (4) we had an intellectual rather than practical agenda. As we began our on-line conversation among English students and teachers at various career stages we wondered: What counts as knowledge within our fields of English and English education? Who "owns" it? Could we challenge traditional power relations and barriers and engage in sincere professional dialogue across groups? What conversations and roles would emerge when we interacted socially to explore our various cultural meanings of a shared discipline? What implications might arise for learning together in other cross-career groups? Could we push the boundaries of disciplinary discussions beyond our separate settings and normal outlets?

Methods

This study engaged 14 students and teachers of English in a two-month, on-line discussion of English and teaching in universities and public schools. The printed data set has been analyzed independently by three different participants (the authors) using the same three agreed-upon themes as lens. The texts of our three papers appear at http://virtual.park.uga.edu/cdesmet/forum/.

Our goal as we move toward publication is to engage in a meta-analysis of our idiosyncratic interpretations as teacher, teacher educator, and English studies scholar to achieve an even deeper level of explanatory power. For this paper, we focus on our participants and methodology as a lens for showing our Deans' Forum collaboration. Our overall questions for this analysis are:

- How do we each read the data given our particular stances in the field?
- How do our interpretations overlap and differ?
- What new questions and issues emerge?

Participants

Sally had worked with The University of Georgia Network for English Teachers and Students (UGA-NETS) for four years at the time of this study. UGA-NETS is a group of 35 plus

English teachers from 10 area high schools with whom Sally and Peg Graham, another Language Education professor, have redesigned and carried out a unique teacher preparation program in secondary English. Stephanie Harrison, the third author of this paper, has been a mentor teacher and leader in UGA-NETS since 1996. Each year, this group of teachers takes on 20-25 preservice teacher candidates who work in their assigned schools all year while taking team-taught, integrated classes from Sally, Peg and doctoral students on campus. (See Hudson-Ross, Graham, & Harrison, 1999). These courses are co-designed by Peg, Sally, and the school-based mentors to connect school and campus experiences and theory and practice through collaborative inquiry. (See Graham, Hudson-Ross, Adkins, McWhorter, & Stewart, 1998; Graham, Hudson-Ross, McWhorter & others, 1997; Hudson-Ross, 1998.) A major component of UGA-NETS is teachers' own professional development and reflective practice.

Given that this group had worked together to prepare English teachers for four years, we thought it would be interesting to hold a discussion among a professor of English--Christy; a professor of English Education--Sally; experienced teachers--including Stephanie; graduates of UGA-NETS now first year teachers in private and public schools; senior undergraduates currently student teaching in UGA-NETS; and freshman/sophomore undergraduates in Christy's literature class.

Christy and Sally, as primary investigators, initiated invitations to "extend the dialogue" of the UGA-NETS group through an e-mail listserv. Christy invited all 150 students in her lower division English class who were interested in teaching English as a career; she also personally invited one English Education masters/certification student enrolled in her graduate Composition Theory course who was Sally's advisee. Sally asked for volunteers from her year-long cohort group of 20 preservice teachers who were entering full-time student teaching. She published an invitation to mentor teachers through the group's weekly bulletin. Finally, Sally posted an invitation to program graduates on a recently set up discussion list for College of Education alumni. Across all groups, 17 participants volunteered; three were not able to remain active after making their introductions. Fourteen people participated fully during the course of the study from March through June 1998. These included

2 freshmen English majors (Victoria, Jessica)
2 English education student teachers (Amy, Tiffany)
4 first year teachers who graduated from UGA (Mark, Scott, Dana, Angela)
4 experienced English teachers (Stephanie, Patti, Dorann, Nancy)
1 English professor (Christy)
1 English educator (Sally)

All participants agreed that our goal was to "explore the relationship between teaching and content knowledge and to think about ways of improving the training of Georgia's future teachers by forging a stronger relationship between the kinds of training UGA undergraduates

receive in the English Department and in the Language Education Program" (Data set, 3/26/99). Those who signed on agreed to read email from the list and respond to the discussion at least one time per week. Each person received $50 for their efforts and lunch on the final day, June 6, when we would meet and jointly examine the data.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data for this study include the printed text of e-mail conversations from Christy's initial welcome to the "E-TEACH" listserv on March 26, 1998, through initial analyses notes from a final in-person meeting on June 6, 1998. Christy took responsibility for setting up and managing the list and for moving the text of emails to the web site. Participants could read messages on email or refer to the web site for memory, although few did.

To begin this discussion among people who did not know one another, Sally and Christy initially posed questions later dubbed "official". For example:

1. Tell us about yourself as a person and teacher. You might want to talk about why you became a teacher or why English is the field of your choice. You might want to talk about other things. Whatever you think is important to knowing you is what we want to hear!

2. How do you "read" a piece of literature when you are getting ready to teach it? How is this kind of "reading" different from or similar to just plain reading a piece of literature or a text? After about a month of discussion, Sally posed a batch of questions such as:
   (a) Freshmen / Sophomores: What questions do you have for us "old timers" including student teachers and teachers?
   (b) We often say we wish we could help students see in books what we do. What resources do we have that they don't ? How could we get those resources to them? After this point, the discussion took on a life of its own with participants posing their own questions and responses.

Sally and Christy became participants more than leaders, finally, and the conversation changed from "recitation" like answers to often passionate, funny, challenging debate and dialogue. Major topics discussed were individualized reading through book clubs, the film as text and in relationship to written texts, writing, student social promotion in middle school, and student behavior including not reading.

In several stages, we began to group and informally examine the data. In moving the data to the web, Christy organized the data into five chronological groups and within those groups into segments by topic or questions we focused on. To prepare for our June 6 meeting, Sally read the data set printed from the web, numbered pages, and prepared another separate outline showing participants on which pages we discussed on-going topics including those Christy identified but also following a topic across other sections as well. For example, although

biographical data occurred primarily at the beginning, the freshmen / sophomores did not get on the list until the group was well into a discussion of how we read; therefore, their biographical information occurs later.

During our June 6 meeting, participants finally got to meet one another. To structure the day, we gave each participant a copy of the data and in pairs, they read segments seeking themes and patterns within a particular chunk. For example, Scott and Stephanie looked at all biographies while Sally and a student teacher, Amy, examined our responses to a question about how we read personally and in order to teach. Sally and Christy also looked at the data later for various in-house presentations of the Deans' Forum and GCTE. However, for this paper, we looked at the data anew and a year after the discussions.

In order to focus our three individual readings of the data, we agreed after several readings to each analyze for three themes that were prevalent and interesting. The following descriptions guided our independent analyses:

1. Cultures and career stages. This gets at our various settings and cultures in schools/colleges and how we define ourselves by those cultures, settings, and our career stages within them (e.g., the freshmen versus seniors all in college but at different stages). We also considered common ways we define one another and our clientele (students) and how we perceive THEIR goals differently.

2. Nature of reading, power, and authority. We considered here what expectations we have for students and for ourselves. How do we perform, "be", think? What limitations do we have given restrictions of environments or parameters of curriculum/traditions, whether they are perceived or real? How do we prepare to teach? What practices can we engage in? do we? do we wish we could? What keeps us where we are? What could lead us elsewhere?

3. Nature of English, the mission of the teacher of English. Here we examined our talk around English as subject or discipline. Are we in this for analysis of literature or to create life-long readers and learners? (We didn't want to fall for a dichotomy...so we asked what other options are there?) How do we (the listserv group) define the field? What do we assume about learners?

Each of us also wrote a two-page "autobiography describing how our own experiences, careers and stages may have influenced our analysis. We met to read and discuss one another's 10 page summaries.

The Nature of English, the Mission of the Teacher of English

Throughout this analysis and our on-line discussions, it is clear that when roles and relationships among students and teachers change, new expertise, new questions, new challenges are likely to emerge. As we enter into such healthy debate, we make our teaching more public

and open for theorizing. Leaving this thinking in only isolated or internal places means that teachers and students do not have opportunities to examine and reconstruct their practice and principles in social and rigorous ways. From our data it is clear that all participants eagerly arose to the opportunity to theorize, contribute, and challenge one another's assumptions, at least in tentative ways. It remains to a future study to explore where such a group might go over time.

For others who might take on such discussions, the following aspects of this study and email experience which support such cross-cultural thinking:

- a safe environment outside course structures, assignments, hierarchies, and evaluations,
- a healthy respect for one another's perspectives and insights by all participants,
- access to computer technology at home as well as at school so that conversations are leisurely,
- a slow but intentional movement toward openness, remaining aware that people new to such dialogue will have to build a culture that welcomes input and reconsideration of long-held beliefs,
- respected leadership to get and keep things going and to push people to think deeper,
- opportunity to think and write quickly--as in email--to engage in conversations but also opportunity to stand aside and examine the text of what we say quickly which often reveals issues we are unconscious of in daily life,
- shared interest in the topic and field of inquiry, e.g., English as experienced by teachers and learners in different contexts,
- people who know one another enough to trust (e.g., our links to UGA-NETS) yet perhaps not in the same settings so we do not have to worry about local offenses or politics or issues. Working across settings forces us to universals.

The Collaborative Design of Mathematics Courses for Elementary Education Majors

Sybilla Beckmann
Associate Professor of Mathematics

Denise S. Mewborn
Associate Professor of Mathematics Education

In 1998, the Board of Regents for the University System of Georgia mandated that all elementary education programs in the state must significantly increase the number of mathematics content courses that future teachers take prior to obtaining certification. As a result, elementary education majors at the University of Georgia now take three mathematics content courses and two mathematics methods courses, all five of which are specifically designed to prepare teachers with strong content knowledge who can apply this knowledge in classroom situations. The necessity for designing and implementing these courses has galvanized a long-term collaborative relationship between faculty in the Mathematics Department and the Mathematics Education Department. In this paper, we describe the origins of our collaboration and the impact of this collaboration, and we argue for the necessity of sustaining such long-term collaborations across colleges.

The Origins of our Collaboration

Sybilla's perspective. About four years ago, around the time that the Deans' Forum was first formed, my children were starting elementary school. For the first time, I became fully aware that the Mathematics Department played a significant role in the mathematics training of prospective elementary teachers. Few mathematics professors were willing to teach courses for prospective elementary teachers. So, I decided to teach these courses and to work on improving them. The outcome is that three new mathematics content courses are being put in place for prospective elementary teachers at the University of Georgia.

When I began to work on the courses for elementary teachers, I already had a history of working and communicating with my colleagues in the Mathematics Education Department. So it was natural to continue these conversations and interactions, and to expand them to include other faculty in the College of Education. Although we had a number of face to face meetings, many of these conversations took place via e-mail. We discussed what topics should or should not be included in the mathematics content courses for prospective elementary teachers. We debated how many courses would be needed for an excellent preparation for elementary teachers. We discussed the philosophy of mathematics courses for prospective elementary teachers. For example, should the main purpose of the courses be to develop certain mathematical habits of mind, or should the focus be on specific content knowledge? Although my initial inclinations were towards the former, I gradually came to recognize the importance of the latter.

In addition to discussions, several of us visited each other's classes and shared course material with each other. These were parts of projects sponsored by the Deans' Forum, and they were particularly helpful in the development of the mathematics courses. By visiting mathematics methods courses, I became much more aware of what goes into learning to teach

mathematics to children. In addition, Denise Mewborn later taught one of the new mathematics courses that I developed. During that time we conferred frequently about the course. All of this provided me with invaluable information that has shaped the nature of the mathematics courses. Some of this was specific techniques and ways of presenting topics, but I also began to develop more of an awareness of issues in teacher education.

Denise's perspective. I have worked as a mathematics educator in both a mathematics department in a College of Arts and Sciences and in a mathematics education department in a College of Education. Regardless of the nature of administrative structures that encapsulate groups of people or the physical distance between departments on a campus, it is all too easy to take a "live and let live" stance with respect to ones colleagues in mathematics. At best, everyone lives happily and quietly in their own little worlds. At worst, this is the stuff of which stereotypes are born. Crossing departmental, college, and curricular boundaries takes time, effort, and courage, but it has proven extremely worthwhile in our case–both for us and for our students.

In some sense, my collaboration with Sybilla began 10 years ago when I was a student in three graduate mathematics courses she taught. This relationship provided an important foundation for our current work because I knew that Sybilla was a dedicated and talented teacher, and Sybilla knew that I had a strong foundation in mathematics.

We recently extended our collaboration by involving some practicing elementary teachers in discussions about the content and structure of mathematics content and methods courses. One teacher was an experienced teacher who was locally recognized as an exemplary mathematics teacher. Four additional teachers had fewer than 5 years of teaching experience and had taken mathematics content and methods courses at the University of Georgia. From these teachers we gained important insights into the challenges of teaching mathematics in elementary school classrooms.

Our collaboration has led to additional, related projects. For example, we have worked together on professional development projects with local elementary schools. Currently, we are seeking funding to develop video-based examples of children's mathematical thinking that can be used in content courses, methods courses, and in professional development training for mathematicians teaching content courses for the first time.

The Impact of Interactions

Sybilla's perspective. It would be all too easy for a mathematician developing courses for prospective elementary teachers to carry this out in isolation from education faculty. Some mathematicians seem to feel that they "own" the subject of mathematics, and have nothing to learn about it from anyone but other mathematicians. In my experience, while I have also benefited greatly from discussions with other mathematicians, interactions with my colleagues in the College of Education have been of prime and crucial significance. One reason is because the mathematics courses for prospective teachers are part of an overall program. To have real impact, the courses in these programs must work together for a synergistic effect: the whole

should be greater than the sum of the parts. This is something we will need to continually strive for, but communication is obviously a key part in making progress.

Another way that interactions with College of Education faculty have been crucial is in becoming aware of the views of particular topics that will be most helpful to teachers. All topics in mathematics can be seen with a variety of lenses, but some will be more appropriate and helpful for teaching. For example, it is no exaggeration to say that fractions can be studied from Kindergarten through graduate level mathematics courses. Obviously, the way that fractions are studied is very different at the different levels. What should a prospective teacher know about fractions so that she will be able to further her students understanding of fractions? This question itself is invisible to most mathematicians, let alone a stab at an answer. But if mathematics courses for teachers are to help prepare teachers to teach mathematics, such questions must be considered. This kind of question has given me a whole new perspective on mathematics; not just on the teaching and learning of mathematics, but on the mathematics itself.

Denise's perspective. The way our mathematics courses for elementary education majors are set up, mathematicians would have been perfectly within their rights to design and implement these courses on their own. They even had the backing of our Board of Regents to do so! However, because of a long-term collaborative relationship between mathematicians and mathematics educators on our campus, they chose to involve many constituents in the design of new courses. As it turned out, the mathematicians contributed a great deal to my thinking about both mathematics content and methods courses for future teachers.

The typical mathematics content course for elementary teachers marches through topics that closely parallel the elementary school mathematics curriculum. At UGA, however, the courses take central themes in mathematics (such as multiplication) and connect them to a host of mathematical topics (such as whole numbers, fractions, decimals, area, combinatorics, and probability). This significant shift in the focus of our courses is due entirely to the insights of mathematicians who saw the potential for courses to focus on unifying mathematical ideas, rather than more isolated topics, in order to give preservice teachers a better picture of the mathematics curriculum.

The design of the content courses has also affected the methods courses. In the methods courses we work hard to help students connect what they are learning to their previous experiences in the content courses. In my case, having taught one of the content courses makes this much easier because I am intimately familiar with the content course. As we fully operationalize our sequence of courses, students will be taking a content course and a methods course concurrently. With some consistent communication between instructors, we should be able to further solidify the connections between the courses.

The Importance of Support for Long-Term Collaborative Work

The question of what kinds of mathematics content and methods courses will best help prepare elementary teachers for the teaching of mathematics is a difficult and subtle one;

therefore one cannot expect to simply put some courses in place and be done with the matter. We have thought carefully about our mathematics content and methods courses, but we must continue to do so, and we must continually evaluate and improve them. Thus, the collaborations that were important in the initial development of the courses will continue to be important, and they must be sustained over a long term.

Further, due to the size of our teacher education program, it is necessary to recruit additional faculty to teach these newly developed mathematics content courses. Because of the importance of these courses, they are not being shuttled to graduate assistants or temporary faculty. Rather, they are being taught by tenured or tenure-track mathematics faculty. As different research mathematicians assume responsibility for these courses, there is an on-going need for professional development opportunities for these faculty. They need opportunities to talk about the content, the manner in which it is presented, the students, the manner in which they learn, and themselves, and the manner in which they teach. Thus, it is important to sustain and expand the collaborative community that is engaging in serious discussions about teacher education.

In the absence of an environment that supports and nurtures long term collaborative work on improving teacher education, this work could easily die out. Universities must think about their reward and support structure: collaborative work takes much time and energy; if it is to be done, it must be valued and it must be nurtured. The Deans' Forum, by its very existence, gives support by nurturing a cohesive group of faculty, and by providing visibility to collaborations to improve teacher preparation. Without a strong support structure, faculty who put time and energy into such collaborative work could easily become disillusioned: the same amount of time and energy might well have yielded greater advances in their original field of study.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Professors at universities and colleges should have broad views of their jobs: they ought to think about what needs to be done, and to do it if possible. This should be as true for instruction and curriculum development as it already is in research. When a program of study reaches across departments and colleges—as in the case of teacher education—the program will surely benefit from the sustained collaboration of the faculty. We believe that our students have benefited from our collaboration. We ourselves have also benefited by seeing our fields from a new perspective. We have enjoyed working together toward a common goal. However, as obviously good and desirable as this is, the practical difficulty of initiating and maintaining such collaborations should not be underestimated. Collaborations require time, energy, and commitment from the faculty involved, and this is time, energy, and commitment not spent on other duties. However, universities and colleges can put in place programs or structures to nurture and maintain collaborations, and to encourage broader thinking about what should count as valuable faculty work. In this way, faculty can do what ought to be done without sacrificing their careers.

Outcomes of the Dean's Forum

Judith Preissle
Professor and Department Head of Social Foundations of Education

Outcomes of innovative experiences vary in direct to indirect form, in the length of time they take to develop, in concreteness to abstractness, and in the related dimensions of tangible to intangible product. The outcomes of the Dean's Forum follow this variable pattern, and we are seeking to document the range and diversity of consequences of participating in it. In this section of the paper we describe our ongoing efforts to document outcomes, we list some of the more tangible efforts of the group, and we offer comments from the two founding deans on the more intangible results.

Documenting activities and outcomes and consciously generating records of those efforts began with the formulation of the Dean's Forum, as described previously in the paper, and has continued throughout its existence. Some of what has been reported here has drawn from an extensive paper trail and email record of activity in a common archive. However, in the spring of 1999 a group of 12 of the forum members gathered to plan additional means of evaluating and assessing the outcomes of this innovation. Their goal was to develop some means of systematic "stock taking" that not only would provide a justification for maintaining the group but also would constitute an ongoing group history and a source of ideas for projecting future directions. They wanted both collective accomplishments and individual consequences to be documented.

The group decided this could best be accomplished through the generation of an online data bank of narratives of Dean's Forum members that would be accessible to all members of the group for analysis and reflection. This record began with extensive interviews of the two founding deans, and material from one of these interviews is included in a subsequent section. The next step will be a collection of testimonials from all the other members of the Dean's Forum willing to contribute such material. The testimonials will be collected by email; members will be asked to describe their participation in the Dean's Forum, what they did, what they believe they learned as a result of participation, and what effect the Dean's Forum had on their professional life. We expect to begin collecting these testimonials spring 2001. These accounts will provide context and meaning for the specific activities we describe next.

Tangible Outcomes

Outcomes that involved products of some kind, presentations, research reports, curriculum and instruction interventions, can be divided into those contributed to by more or less the whole forum, common efforts, and those devised by forum subgroups. As described previously, the common topic for the initial three years was reform in teacher education. The group sought and was awarded a funded grant from the Council on Basic Education (CBE) and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) to assess Georgia's Standards-Based Teacher Education Project (STEP); this also involved input into Georgia's P-16

education effort. A second grant proposal to the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) on fostering university-wide collaboration in teaching and learning reform was not funded. Another common effort was input on the design and selection of members of the University of Georgia's Advisory Council for Educator Preparation (ACEP), a group composed of teacher educators, arts and sciences faculty members, and public schoolteachers. Finally, forum members developed presentations for one another at their common meetings that drew on individual expertise: these included social and natural histories of the places where meetings were held, the future of technology in teaching and learning, democracy in the classroom, animation in film study, learning theory, the ethics of being a faculty member, the life of Charles Darwin, the scholarship of teaching, and southern literature.

A second set of tangible outcomes was a sequence of small groups efforts. Although the groups varied in size from pairs to collections of 5-6 individuals, the composition always constituted some mix of arts and sciences and education faculty members. The first collection of these activities resulted in formal cooperative efforts in research and instruction. The eleven topics varied enormously: understanding and reducing the barriers to team-teaching at the University of Georgia; preservice teachers' beliefs and attitudes about language variation and linguistically diverse students; teaching aesthetics and bridging the chasm between high school and the university; content knowledge and pedagogy in the English Language Arts classroom; enhancement of critical thinking skills of students in general chemistry and general biology courses; undergraduates' backgrounds in ethics and moral theory; an ongoing seminar on topics in mathematics and mathematics education; a history network to connect the university with public schoolteachers and students; an impact study on student intellectual engagement in large introductory survey courses; a colloquium on how collaboration can enhance teaching and preparation for future Georgia schoolchildren in science; and an art and education partnership to engage middle school students in documenting their county's folklore. In some cases people presented their reports and went on to other matters, but some of these have developed into ongoing projects, as described previously in this paper.

This was followed by a second set of cross-pairs activities in which arts and sciences and education paired faculty worked collaboratively on either a new research or instruction project or an extension of their initial activity. Forum members have reported a number of outcomes for these first two small group efforts. Several have presented material from their forum activities at professional meetings and are developing journal submissions. Others have submitted internal and external grant proposals; the $800,000 Business-to-Teaching grant won from the Georgia Board of Regents has been linked to forum activity. One small group won a Smithsonian National Museum Award for their forum project, and a member of this group won a Top Ten of Ehrlich Award for Service Learning. Nearly everyone in the forum has reported influences on their instruction, including those who have developed long term collaborations across the two colleges.

The most recent small group effort has been an organization of forum members into issues groups generated at a Deans' Forum meeting in the fall of 2000. Outcomes of this activity will be reported to the full forum in the fall of 2001.

The Deans' Interpretations of These Outcomes

What do such outcomes mean and how do they benefit the institution, the professions, and the individuals who participate in them? To address these and other questions, the two founding deans were interviewed about the Deans' Forum[1]. The outcomes they emphasized were all intangibles. They both spoke at length on the importance of the increased and sustained interaction and communication between faculty members in education and in arts and sciences. A second outcome they focused on was program impact, program building, and problem solving across programs. Both deans talked eloquently about the increased understanding they saw between the two units, and the dean from education viewed the Deans' Forum as constituting a kind of common curriculum in professional development created by the two faculties and their leaders. The tangible outcomes described previously were all considered in the service of these more abstract outcomes, outcomes that the two deans implied were longer lasting than any particular accomplishment and that indicated institutional as well as individual transformation.

Interaction and communication. The two deans agreed on having achieved their initial goal of fostering more interaction and communication between faculty in their two colleges.

> Yeany: If you look at what we are doing [interaction], it is not very unique..., but to sustain formal interaction is something that I think is fairly unique....What we are actually having is a form of enhanced networking occurring now that is very mutual to both of the facult[ie]s....Once it's experienced [increased communication], then the value of it is self-evident and there is a desire to participate....The interaction between two colleges and two deans, what is often the two major colleges on a campus and two quite different politics, is something that is essential....At the institutional level, institutions being colleges, it is needed; it is doable, so not only is it well received by participants, at the next level it works.

[1] Russell Yeany, then Dean of the College of Education, was interviewed by Judith Preissle and Ed Pajak July 26, 1999. This interview was subsequently transcribed, and Dean Yeany vetted the transcript. At resent, only this interview has been cleared for presentation, so we include only quotations from the education dean. However, the commentary is based on a preliminary analysis of both interview transcripts by Judith Preissle.

Program building and development. Problem solving across units for the development of programs viewed as common investments was an outcome of the Deans' Forum valued by both leaders.

> Yeany: We didn't operate as a forum where you would show up and fill your bucket and go home. You had to fill other buckets before you were allowed to fill your own. And, people did that. The people who received the most gave the most to the forum....You have heard me say numerous times it is all about faculty, we can't be any better than our faculty. Each time you have this kind of renewed feeling and belief that we have good faculty, then you feel good about the future. You feel good about the programs. That was one part of it. I think that every discussion that we [the Deans' Forum] had had an impact on me....There still has to be certain respect and regard for autonomy and independence of programs, but we will do it realizing that we are a part of each other's programs, and as things now change within programs, the other college will be given consideration....We were trying this to really help the two colleges do what should be done to get our faculty together to help them do their jobs better and help them be better faculty members.

Increased understanding between the two faculties. Mutual understanding was viewed by these two deans as both an outcome of participation in the Deans' Forum and as a means to better communication, increased collaboration, and joint program development.

> Yeany: A research-one institution of a large size is a very difficult place for a college of education to carry out a traditional mission of preparing educators. We need something like the forum so that these research type, arts and sciences faculty members, I am saying that in a positive way, can learn about us and us about them. If not, because of the very nature of our institution, we'll go this way and ya'll go that, and the College of Education will be the loser in that.

The Deans' Forum as an institutional curriculum. Finally the Dean of the College of Education formulated a final outcome of the program as providing a common curriculum for education and arts and sciences faculty members in professional development. This engagement was also recognized by the Dean of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences.

> Yeany: What we might have had as a Deans' Forum at any moment was a curriculum that faculty were engaging in, that faculty developed the curriculum--often we strive for faculty development through various mechanisms that we have. We have minigrant programs. We have travel funding. You go down through the list, but we don't have an honest curriculum. At times the Deans' Forum was a curriculum for that. I think it was

impacting the two of us as deans as much as it was the faculty....Even if it just makes this a better place to work, because we can, given the occasion, become students ourselves of the topic, that we can engage in this curriculum, what I call professional development curriculum, that is enough.

Summary

A diverse collection of 30 faculty members from an arts and sciences college and an education college, meeting two or three times a year, may accomplish different things in different settings. What we see here is a group who sought and achieved tangible and intangible goals that interrelated and supported one another. A common thread, teacher education, provided some unity during the initial years during which the faculty members had the time to work together to discover that their teaching, learning, and inquiry in different fields had many similarities and involved shared issues and problems. The balance between unifying common concerns, on the one hand, and the differences in goals and activities of the small group and paired projects, on the other hand, may be another key to the success claimed by this group and their deans.

Extending and Sustaining the Great Conversation

The five essays above provide snapshots of the Deans' Forum and its activities through the lenses of eight members of the Forum. The essays provide evidence of the level of engagement, the type of scholarship, and the impact of the collaborations in the Forum. They also provide support for Shulman's argument that the direction of the Great Conversion is strongly influence by those involved and their academic and pedagogical backgrounds. Certainly, the dialogue about teacher preparation at the University of Georgia has been significantly enhance by expanding the Great Conversation to include faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences.

At an institution as large as the University of Georgia, the dialogue about teacher preparation cannot be carried by thirty faculty and two deans. Thus, in the spring of 2000, one-third of the original members of the Forum rotated to "emeritus" status, and new members joined the Forum. New members were selected from among nominations by current members to achieve racial, gender and academic diversity within the Forum while maintaining the original criteria that members must be "opinion leaders" in their colleges. By expanding the membership of the Deans' Forum, we hope to bring fresh perspectives to our work and to engage a broader set of individuals in this intensive conversation about teacher preparation. After several more iterations, we hope to have a critical mass of faculty in the two colleges who sustain the discussion about teacher preparation outside the bounds of the Forum.

In addition to our efforts to bring new members into the Forum, we are looking for ways to share the work of the Forum with a larger audience. For example, a seminar series is planned in which Forum members will share their work with faculty, staff, and students throughout campus. Some seminar sessions may feature national speakers whose work contributes to the goals of the Forum. Some Forum members are looking for publication outlets for their work. Others are involving more P-12 educators in their work. In all cases, the desire is to bring more voices into the Great Conversation and to have the Great Conversation received by more ears.

References

Anderson, V., & Stepp, D.R. (1999, June 6). From theory to reality: New teachers discover training gap. *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, pp. 1A.

Ball, D.L., & McDiarmid, G.W. (1990). The subject-matter preparation of teachers. In W.R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 437-339). New York: MacMillan.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates. (1998). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities.* Available on-line: http://notes.cc.sunysb.edu/pres/boyer.nsf/webform/images/$file/boyer.txt.

Bransford, J., Brown, A.L., & Cocking, R.R. (Eds.) (1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Christenbury, L. (1994). *Making the journey: Being and becoming a teacher of English language arts*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Clark, R.J., & LaLonde, D.E. (1992). A case for department-based professional development sites for secondary teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43 (1), 35-41.

Dilworth, C., & McCracken, N. M. (1997). Ideological cross-currents in English studies and English Education: A report of a national survey of professors' beliefs and practices. *English Education*, 29 (1), 7-17.

Gardner, H., & Boix-Mansilla, V. (1994). Teaching for understanding in the disciplines--and beyond. *Teachers College Record*, 96 (2), 198-218.

Graff, G. (1992). *Beyond the culture wars: How teaching the conflicts can revitalize American education*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Graham, P., Hudson-Ross, S., & McWhorter, P. with S. Burns, G. Speaks James, F. Bullock, & J. Anderson. (May, 1997). Building nets: Evolution of a collaborative inquiry community within a high school English teacher education program. *English Education*, 29 (2), 91-129.

Graham, P., Hudson-Ross, S., Adkins, C., McWhorter, P., & McDuffie, J. (Eds). (1999). *Teacher/Mentor: A dialogue for collaborative learning*. New York: Teachers College Press and the National Council of Teachers of English.

Grossman, P. (1989). Learning to teach without teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 91 (2), 191-208.

Grossman, P. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Grossman, P. L., & Stodolsky, S.S. (1995). Content as context: The role of school subjects in secondary school teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 24 (8), 5-11, 23.

Hudson-Ross, S. (1998, Sept./Oct.). A discipline-based "professional development faculty" in secondary teacher education: A case for multiple-site collaborative reform in the disciplines. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49 (4), 266-275.

Hudson-Ross, S., Graham, P., & Harrison, S. (1999, July). *Building networks for English teachers and students: Learning together across the years*. Paper presented at the IFTE Conference, Coventry, England.

Hudson-Ross, S., & McWhorter, P. (1995, February). Going back / Looking in: A teacher educator and high school teacher explore beginning teaching together. *English Journal*, 84 (2), 46-54.

Kuhn, T.S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marshall, J., & Smith, J. (1994) *Mixed messages: The literary education of English teachers*. Paper presented at the National Council of Teachers of English, Orlando.

Merseth, K.K. (1991). Supporting beginning teachers with computer networks. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42, 140-147.

Miller, L., & Silvernail, D.L. (1994). Wells Junior High School: Evolution of a professional development school. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession* (pp. 28-29). New York: Teachers College Press.

Morgan, R. (1995, April). Three unspeakable things: Looking through English's family album. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, 29 (1), 3-33.

National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.

Rabinowitz, P. J., & Smith, M.W. (1998). *Authorizing readers : Resistance and respect in the teaching of literature*. New York : Teachers College Press.

Richardson, V. (1997). Constructivist teaching and teacher education: Theory and practice. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education: Building new understandings* (pp. 3-14). London: Falmer Press.

Rorty, R. (1979). Philosophy and the mirror of nature. Princeton, Princeton University Press. [Cited in Bruffee, K.A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the 'conversation of mankind'. *College English*, 46 (7), 635-652.]

Schlagal, B., Trathen, W., & Blanton, W. (1996). Structuring telecommunications to create instructional conversations about student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 47 (3), 175-183.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 3-36). New York: Macmillan.

Shulman, L. S. (1986, Feb.) Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15 (2), 4-14.

Shulman, L., & Sparks, D. (Winter 1992). Merging content knowledge and pedagogy: An interview with Lee Shulman. *Journal of Staff Development*, 13 (1), 14-16.

Singer, E.R. (1996). Espoused teaching paradigms of college faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 37 (6), 659-679.

Siskin, L.S. (1991, May). Departments as different worlds: Subject subcultures in secondary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 27 (2), 134-60.

Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, M.E. (1995). *How English teachers get taught*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Thomas, L., Clift, R.T., & Sugimoto, T. (1996). Telecommunication, student teaching, and methods instruction: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46 (3), 165-174.

Whitford, B.L. (1994). Permission, persistence, and resistance: Linking high school restructuring with teacher education reform. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession* (pp. 74-97). New York: Teachers College Press.

Contact Information for Authors

All authors, except Stephanie Harrison, can be reached by mail using the following address:

Name
Department
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Sybilla Beckmann
Mathematics Department
sybilla@math.uga.edu

Victoria Davion
Philosophy Department
vdavion@arches.uga.edu

Christy Desmet
English Department
cdesmet@english.uga.edu

Stephanie Harrison
Madison County High School
P.O. Box 7, Old Comer Road
Danielsville, GA, 30633, USA
sharris@coe.uga.edu

Sally Hudson-Ross
Language Education Department
saross@coe.uga.edu

Denise S. Mewborn
Mathematics Education Department
dmewborn@coe.uga.edu

Jenny Penny Oliver
College of Education Dean's Office
jpo@coe.uga.edu

Judith Preissle
Social Foundations of Education Department
preissle@coe.uga.edu

Hugh Ruppersburg
Franklin College of Arts and Sciences
hruppers@franklin.uga.edu